01			
02			
03			
04			
05			
06		S DISTRICT COURT CT OF WASHINGTON	
07			
08	NATHAN R. GONINAN,) CASE NO. C09-0934-RAJ-MAT	
09	Plaintiff,)	
10	v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S) MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF	
11	JONES, et al.,) COUNSEL	
12	Defendants.))	
13		,	
14	This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.		
15	The Court, having reviewed plaintiff's motion, and the balance of the record, does hereby find		
16	and ORDER:		
17	(1) Plaintiff's motion for appointr	nent of counsel (Dkt. 6) is DENIED. There is no	
18	right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Although the Court,		
19	under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request co	unsel to represent a party proceeding in forma	
20	pauperis, the Court may do so only in excepti	ional circumstances. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789	
21	F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984);		
22	Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 19	80). A finding of exceptional circumstances	
	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	N	
	PAGE -1		

01	requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the
02	plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.
03	Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331. Plaintiff has not, at this juncture, demonstrated any likelihood that
04	he will succeed on the merits of his case. Thus, plaintiff has not demonstrated that this case
05	involves exceptional circumstances which warrant appointment of counsel.
06	(2) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to plaintiff.
07	DATED this 14th day of August, 2009.
08	macdeedlin
09	Mary Alice Theiler United States Magistrate Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	